

REMARKS

The Examiner's acknowledgment of the claim of priority and receipt of the priority document is noted with appreciation.

The specification has been reviewed and editorial revisions made where seen to be appropriate.

The objections by the Chief Draftsman to the drawings originally submitted have been duly noted and revisions made where appropriate as submitted on the attached pages. Specifically, the cross-hatching has been amended in Fig. 2 to accurately portray film 14a as a metal. Further, Fig. 4 has been amended to include the legend of "Prior Art." Support for the amendment of the drawings is found throughout the application, particularly on page 5, lines 6-12, and page 1, lines 9-12, respectively.

Claims 1-4, 6, and 7-13 are now active in this application. Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended, largely to incorporate the subject matter formerly contained within Claim 5. Claims 8-13 have been added. Support for the amendment of Claim 1 is found throughout the application, particularly on page 3, lines 18-20, and page 5, lines 13-15. Support for the addition of Claims 8-13 is found throughout the application, particularly on page 3, lines 14-17, and page 5, lines 6-12. No new matter has been introduced into the application.

Claims 1-3, and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Manley (USP 4,371,742). This rejection is respectfully traversed as being moot in view of the amendment to Claim 1.

The disclosed and claimed invention provides an EMI-suppressing cable having a magnetic material layer formed on the outer surface of the shielding layer. The cable includes a shielding layer formed on an outer surface of a signal wire and a magnetic material layer wound on an outer surface of the shielding layer. This magnetic material layer has a ferrite resin layer formed on one surface of a film by printing. This construction provides excellent EMI-suppressing characteristics to the cable. Moreover, the degree of the shielding effect can be easily controlled since a printing thickness of the ferrite resin layer can be easily adjusted. The structure of the cable, with the treatment of the ferrite layer, increases the productivity of manufacture and thereby decreases the cost of manufacture.

In regard to Manley teaching that the resin binder is formed on the face of the film by printing, particularly in the citation given (Col. 5, lines 58–62), the Examiner is in error, as Manley does not teach printing as a method of forming the EMI-ameliorating structure. Rather, Manley teaches the formation of a coated web structure (Col. 5, line 62) by loading the ferromagnetic resin onto a resin matrix (Col. 3, line 68) where the components form an integral layer (Col. 6, lines 16 and 17) and not the two-layer structure provided by the present invention. As Manley does not teach the printing method or the resulting two-layer structure claimed in Claim 1 of the present application, all rejections to Claim 1 and its dependant Claims 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7, in view of Manley are respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Manley in view of Ikeda et al.(JP Pat No. 11-185542). This rejection is also respectfully traversed, further in view of the amendment to Claim 1.

Ikeda et al. fails to compensate for the deficiencies previously recited in Manley as a basis for rejection of Claim 1. Specifically, Ikeda et al. does not teach a layered structure formed by printing and thus, Manley and Ikeda et al. cannot be properly combined to make a *prima facie* demonstration of obviousness for a proper rejection of Claim 4, as Claim 4 is dependent on and encompasses all features described within Claim 1.

Claim 8 is added to emphasize an important aspect of the invention, primarily that the invention does not require a separate shielding layer to be formed between the signal wire and the film layer, as the metallic film has the effect of intercepting noises as achieved by the shielding layer. Support is found in the application on page 3, lines 14-17 and on page 5, lines 6-12. By omitting the shielding layer, production time, material, and cost may be reduced. Consideration of these factors is not addressed in the embodiments and configurations of either Manly or Ikeda et al.

In regard to the Examiner's stated presumption in regard to common ownership and inventorship of the subject matter of the respective claims, as the undersigned is currently advised, all subject matter claimed in the application is commonly owned at the time the application was filed and the stated inventorship is correct.

Since all rejections, objections and requirements contained in the outstanding official action have been fully answered and shown to be in error and/or inapplicable to the present claims, it is respectfully submitted that reconsideration is now in order under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) and

such reconsideration is respectfully requested. Upon reconsideration, it is also respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is therefore respectfully requested.

If an extension of time is required for this response to be considered as being timely filed, a conditional petition is hereby made for such extension of time. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-2041 (Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P.C.).

Respectfully submitted,



C. Lamont Whitham
Reg. No. 22,424

Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P. C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, Virginia 20190

Customer Number: **30743**
(703) 787-9400